

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed this Application in light of the Office Action mailed January 10, 2006. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled due to an election/restriction requirement and Claims 8-20 are pending in this Application. Claims 8, 12-14 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and Claims 9-11 and 15-17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 8 and 14 have been amended to further define various features of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### **Election/Restriction Requirement**

In the Office Action mailed January 10, 2006, the Examiner set forth an election restriction requirement of the following claimed inventions:

- I. Claims 1-7, drawn to information handling system, classified in class 361, subclass 780;
- II. Claims 8-13, drawn to a printed circuit board structure, classified in class 174, subclass 255; and
- III. Claims 14-20, drawn to a process of making the printed circuit board of Invention II, classified in class 29, subclass 846.

During a telephone conversation with the Examiner and Applicant's attorney on January 4, 2006, Applicant made a provisional election with traverse to prosecute the invention of Groups II and III, Claims 8-20. Applicant hereby confirms that election. Accordingly, Applicant hereby cancels Claims 1-7 without prejudice or disclaimer and elects that the cancelled claims are subject to the filing of a divisional application.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 8, 12-14 and 18-20 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0118600 by Seok-Kyu Lee et al. ("Lee"). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal*

*Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art as anticipatory by the Examiner cannot anticipate the rejected Claims, because the cited art does not show all the elements of the present Claims.

Claim 8 recites:

A printed circuit board, comprising:  
a first core;  
a second core; and  
an insulating material having regions of increased permittivity, the insulating material operable to couple the first core to the second core and the regions of increased permittivity disposed proximate to at least one hybrid power plane defined between the first core and the second core.

Lee fails to disclose, teach or suggest this combination of limitations. For example, Lee fails to disclose, teach or suggest “an insulating material having regions of increased permittivity, the insulating material operable to couple the first core to the second core and the regions of increased permittivity disposed proximate to at least one hybrid power plane defined between the first core and the second core.” (emphasis added) as specifically recited in Claim 8. In particular, Lee fails to disclose, teach or suggest a “hybrid power plane” as specifically recited in Claim 8.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Lee fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Claim 8, and, therefore, cannot anticipate Claim 8. For analogous reasons, Lee fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Claim 14 and, therefore, cannot anticipate Claim 14. Given that Claims 12 and 13 depend from Claim 8 and Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 12, 13 and 18-20 are allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and full allowance of Claims 8, 12-14 and 18-20.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates Examiner's consideration and indication that Claims 9-11 and 15-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant will await further decision on the remaining claims before taking further action regarding objected to Claims 9-11 and 15-17.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 8-20.

Applicant believes there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney at 512.322.2548.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicant



Brian E. Szymczak  
Reg. No. 47,120

Date: 4/7/2006

**SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:**  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

CUSTOMER NO. **23640**  
512.322.2548  
512.322.8383 (fax)